



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,286	10/10/2001	Christopher Peiffer	1014-152US01	9849

7590 04/07/2006
Kent J. Sieffert
Shumaker & Sieffert, P.A.
Suite 105
8425 Seasons Parkway
St. Paul, MN 55125

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/975,286

Applicant(s)

PEIFFER, CHRISTOPHER

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8 and 11-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8 and 11-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/4/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-16 are subject to examination. Claims 6, 9, 10 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/4/2006, pages 6-9, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-16 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "the cited reference fails to disclose a method for comparing an unknown string to a predefined string".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments.

Contrary to applicant's assertions, the limitations a method for comparing an unknown string to a predefined string (e.g., col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) are clearly taught by the reference Branstad et al., 6,842,860, Networks Associates Technology (Hereinafter Branstad). Also, the specification, page 16, lines 12-21 clearly states, "While the present invention has been particularly shown and described with reference to the foregoing preferred embodiments, those skilled in the art will understand that many variations may be made therein without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention as defined in the following claims. The description of the invention should be understood to include all novel and nonobvious combinations of elements described herein, and claims may be presented in this or a later application to any novel and nonobvious combination of these elements". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Art Unit:

Applicant argues (2), “None of the references disclose amended claimed limitations of the claims, i.e., performing a bitwise exclusive OR operation between two strings”, “applying a predetermined flag to a result of the exclusive OR operation to produce an indicator”, “a bitwise AND operation between a result of the bitwise operation and a predetermined flag to produce a single bit output that indicates whether a case-insensitive match exists between the predefined string and the unknown string”.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations of the claims to perform the XOR operation are rejected by combined teachings of Branstad and HTTP 1.1, Fielding et al., June 28 2001, pages 1-6, Chapter 3 Protocol Parameters”, pages 1-10, Chapter 4 HTTP Message, pages 1-4, Chapter 14 Header Field Definitions, pages 1-37 (Hereinafter Fielding). In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Branstad discloses a computer-implemented method for comparing (e.g., col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) the strings (e.g., message content with or without errors, figure 12, col., 3, lines 9 – 39).

Further, limitations, “exclusive OR operation between two strings”, “applying a predetermined flag to a result of the exclusive OR operation to produce an indicator”, “a bitwise AND operation between a result of the bitwise operation and a predetermined flag to produce a single bit output that indicates whether a case-insensitive match exists between the predefined string and the unknown string”, has been newly added, which is

Art Unit:

addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (3), “the cited reference Branstad fails to disclose applying XOR operation to two strings”, and states, “Branstad describes application of an XOR operation when computing an authentication tag from an outbound message. Branstad describes the use of an XOR operation when generating an authentication tag from a single message, i.e. an outbound message for a network packet”.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The Branstad reference not only discloses, “application of an XOR operation when computing an authentication tag from an outbound message. Branstad describes the use of an XOR operation when generating an authentication tag from a single message, i.e. an outbound message for a network packet”, e.g., col., 22, lines 2-21, but also discloses applying XOR operation to two strings (e.g., col., 22, lines 2 – 21, col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48). Branstad also discloses a computer-implemented method for comparing (e.g., col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) two strings (e.g., message content with or without errors, figure 12, col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 9 - 39). Also, the specification, page 16, lines 12-21 clearly states, “While the present invention has been particularly shown and described with reference to the foregoing preferred embodiments, those skilled in the art will understand that many variations may be made therein without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention as defined in the following claims. The description of the invention should be understood to include all novel and nonobvious combinations of elements described herein, and claims may be presented in this or a later application to

Art Unit:

any novel and nonobvious combination of these elements”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

The following title is suggested: “Performing case-insensitive matching on header over networks to reduce latency”. (Note: this rejection was originally presented in office action dated, 10/04/2005, which applicant did not respond in response dated 1/4/2006).

4. The specification is objected to because it contains hyperlinks (lines 8-9, page 8). Appropriate action is required. (Note: this rejection was originally presented in office action dated, 10/04/2005, which applicant did not respond in response dated 1/4/2006).

Response to Amendment

5. The amendment filed 1/4/2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

Art Unit:

- a. addition of limitations, "between the predefined string and the unknown string by applying a predefined flag to a result of the exclusive OR operation to produce an indicator", in claim 1,
- b. addition of limitations, "by performing a bitwise AND operation between a result of the bitwise operation and a predetermined flag to produce a single output that indicates whether a case-insensitive match exists between the predefined string and the unknown string", in claim 24,
- c. addition of limitations, "by performing a bitwise AND operation between a result of the exclusive OR operation and a predetermined flag", in claim 25,
- d. addition of limitations, "between the predefined string and the unknown string by applying a predefined flag to a result of the exclusive OR operation to produce an indicator", in claim 26.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter, to avoid abandonment of this application, in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 6. Claims 1, 24-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art to use and/or make the invention.

Art Unit:

The specification does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, “between the predefined string and the unknown string by applying a predefined flag to a result of the exclusive OR operation to produce an indicator”, as cited in claims 1 and 26. Note: Claim 1, line 6, clearly claims that at least a segment of the unknown string is used for XOR operation (and not necessarily the whole unknown string), whose result is not enough for identifying a case-insensitive string match between the predefined string and the unknown string (whole string). Further it is, “a value of a predefined flag” that is used for the operation, and “a value of an indicator” is produced by the operation, as the value indicates the case-insensitive string match.

The specification does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, “by performing a bitwise AND operation between a result of the bitwise operation and a predetermined flag to produce a single output that indicates whether a case-insensitive match exists between the predefined string and the unknown string”, as cited in claims 24. Note: It is, “a value of a predefined flag” that is used for the operation, and not the flag itself.

The specification does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, “by performing a bitwise AND operation between a result of the exclusive OR operation and a predetermined flag”, as cited in claims 25. Note: It is, “a value of a predefined flag” that is used for the operation, and not the flag itself.

Examiner has reviewed the specification (and also OCR whole document) and could not find support for the additional limitations as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit:

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 14-17, 19-20, 22, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branstad in view of Fielding and Smith et al., 6,377,991 (Hereinafter Smith).

9. As per claim 1, Branstad discloses a computer-implemented method for comparing (e.g., col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) an unknown string (e.g., message content with or without errors, figure 12, col., 3, lines 9 - 39) to a predefined string (e.g., col., 3, lines 26 – 38), the method comprising:

identifying a predefined string (e.g., col., 3, lines 26 – 38);

identifying an unknown string for comparison with the predefined string (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48);

performing a bitwise exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2 – 21, col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) on at least a segment of the unknown string (e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34) and at least a segment of the predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27); and

identifying string match based on the exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2 – 21).

Bradstad also discloses exclusive OR operation between the two strings (e.g., block 1756, block 1760, figure 17B) and a result of the exclusive OR operation (e.g., col.,

Art Unit:

22, lines 2-21, figure 17B, note: it is also inherent that an exclusive OR operation produces a result).

However, Branstad does not specifically mention about usage of strings having an ASCII binary representation and string being a case-insensitive string.

Fielding discloses well-known usage of strings having an ASCII (e.g., section 3.4, page 4) binary representation (e.g., section 14.15, page 16) and string being a case-insensitive string (e.g., section 3.4, page 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad with the teachings of Fielding in order to facilitate usage of strings having an ASCII binary representation and string being a case-insensitive string because the ASCII binary representation would help support communicating information among two entities using the ASCII character set. The case-insensitive implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

Branstad and Fielding do not specifically mention about applying a predefined flag to the result and to produce an indicator.

However, Smith discloses the well-known concept applying a predefined flag to the result and to produce an indicator (e.g., col., 15, lines 17 – 62, figures 3, 5-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad and Fielding with the teachings of Smith in order to facilitate usage of applying a predefined flag to the result and to produce an indicator because the predefined flag would support deciding what the result value is from the possible result values of the result. The indicator would enhance

Art Unit:

supporting the communicating information, as it would provide information on whether the string match has occurred or not.

10. As per claim 2, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

identifying a segment of the predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27) and identifying a segment of the unknown string (e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34) for comparison (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48) with the predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27).

11. As per claims 3, 20, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

the segment of the predefined string and the segment of the unknown string contain a same number of characters, the lengths of each of the strings are equal (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48).

12. As per claim 5, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Fielding also discloses usage of a case-insensitive (e.g., section 3.4, page 4) segment match (e.g., section 14.16, page 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate usage of a case-insensitive segment match because the segment and would help support communicating information among two entities using the ASCII character set.

Art Unit:

The case-insensitive implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

13. As per claim 8, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses usage identifying a subsequent segment of the predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27) and a subsequent segment of the unknown string (e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34) for comparison (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48).

14. As per claims 14-17, 19, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Fielding also discloses the segments each include one character (e.g., section 14.2, page 2) / four characters (e.g., section 14.19, page 19, section 14.23, page 21), the unknown string including an HTTP header field (e.g., section, 14.1, page 1), the predefined string is from a table of predetermined HTTP header fields (e.g., section 14, page 1, section 14.1, page 1, section 14.2, page 2), identifying the length of strings (e.g., section 14.13, page 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate each of the segments each include one character / four characters, the unknown string including an HTTP header field, the predefined string is from a table of predetermined HTTP header fields and identifying the length of strings because the character / four characters, HTTP header field, predetermined HTTP header field and the length of strings would enhance communicating information among two entities using the

Art Unit:

ASCII character set. The case-insensitive implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

15. As per claims 22 and 23, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Fielding also discloses determining if characters of the strings are within a predefined ASCII range (e.g., section 14.24, page 22, section 14.27, page 25), characters not within the predefined ASCII range causes to yield a negative string match (e.g., section 14.26, page 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate determining if characters of the strings are within a predefined ASCII range and characters not within the predefined ASCII range causes to yield a negative string match because usage of the determination of characters within a predefined ASCII range and the negative string would enhance communicating information among two entities using the ASCII character set. The case-insensitive implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

16. As per claim 26, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

an article of manufacture comprising a storage medium having a plurality of machine-readable instructions executed by a computing system (e.g., col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21 - 34).

Art Unit:

17. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branstad, Fielding and Smith in view of James et al., 6,523,108 (Hereinafter James).

18. As per claim 24, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

use in a computer network (e.g., col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21 - 34) and the corresponding characters (e.g., col., 10, lines 9 – 34).

However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about performing AND operation.

James discloses the well-known concept of performing the bitwise AND operation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith with the teachings of James in order to facilitate usage of performing the bitwise AND operation because the bitwise AND operation would enhance deciding whether both the bits are having a value of “1” or not. The outcome of the bitwise AND operation i.e., “1” or “0” or would enhance informing for the string that would help support communicating information between two entities.

19. As per claim 25, Branstad, Fielding, Smith and James disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

a computer networking device for improving data transfer via a computer network (e.g., col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21 - 34).

Art Unit:

20. Claims 4, 7, 11-13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branstad, Fielding and Smith in view of "Official Notice".

21. As per claim 4, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses left-shifting the content of the segments if the segments contain less than predetermined number of string contents (e.g., col., 22, lines 3 – 39).

However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about shifting when less than four characters exist.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing usage of shifting when less than four characters exist is well known and expected in the art. For example, Thinkage GCOS8 SS C Reference Manual, pages 1-71, 1996, discloses usage of these limitations, e.g., section, 2.7, page 6, section, 4.7, page 34, section, 4.12, page 36.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of shifting when less than four characters with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate shifting when less than four characters exist because the shifting would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

22. As per claims 7 and 13, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically

Art Unit:

mention about predetermined value 0x20202020. For example, Abgrall et al., 2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0x20202020 (0x20 for each byte), e.g., paragraphs 323 and 324.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing predetermined value 0x20202020 is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0x20202020 with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate using value 0x20202020 (as the predetermined value 0x20202020 represents four blank characters) would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

23. As per claim 12, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about predetermined value 0x20.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing predetermined value 0x20 is well known and expected in the art. For example, Abgrall et al., 2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0x20, e.g., paragraphs 323 and 324.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0x20 with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate using value 0x20 (as the predetermined value 0x20 represents blank character) would enhance

Art Unit:

supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

24. As per claims 10, 18, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about the result is operated on in another bitwise operation.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing the result is operated on in another bitwise operation is well known and expected in the art. For example, Kontio et al., 2005/0004875, January 6, 2005, discloses these limitations, e.g., paragraphs 54 and 55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing the result is operated on in another bitwise operation with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate further operating on the result because the another bitwise operation would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

25. As per claim 11, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about predetermined value 0.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing predetermined value 0 is well known and expected in the art. For example, Abgrall et al.,

Art Unit:

2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0, e.g., paragraphs 323 and 324.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0 with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate shifting using value 0 (as the predetermined value 0 represents null value) would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

26. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branstad, Fielding and Smith in view of Slater et al., 6,654,796, Cisco (Hereinafter Slater)

27. As per claim 21, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about WAN.

Slater discloses the network being WAN (e.g., col., 1, lines 55 – 67, col.,9, lines 42 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith with the teachings of Slater in order to facilitate the network being WAN because the WAN would support communicating string information from one entity to another entity. The entity over the WAN would support exclusive OR operation.

Art Unit:

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. For example, Narin, 2002/0091755 discloses usage of number of predefined headers along with supplemental headers. Brown, 5,740,361, discloses string bits / header authentication using HTTP protocol and headers like Accept-Encoding, WWW-Authenticate by XORing several times and using, for example, one-character string "/" for "http://www.foo.com" string over the Internet. Mitzenmacher et al., 5,953,503, discloses HTTP headers with ASCII characters with preset dictionaries.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim,

Art Unit:

other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

March 27, 2009


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100